DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 427 421 EA 029 660

AUTHOR Richardson, Lystra M.
TITLE Stress in the Superintendency: Implications for Achieving Excellence.
PUB DATE 1998-00-00
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration (St. Louis, MO, October 30-November 1, 1998).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Burnout; Elementary Secondary Education; School Administration; Stress Management; *Stress Variables; *Superintendents; *Work Environment
IDENTIFIERS *Connecticut

ABSTRACT

This paper reports on a study that identified the perceived sources of stress experienced by school superintendents in Connecticut. The theoretical framework for the study comprised Stages One and Two of the Administrator Stress Cycle. Data were supplied by the Administrative Stress Index, which was distributed to all 149 superintendents in Connecticut, and by the Superintendent Stress Inventory, which was used as a protocol in conducting interviews. Research was supplemented with various questions, such as What are the major sources of stress perceived by superintendents in Connecticut? and What is the perceived level of conflict-mediating stress among superintendents in the state? Results indicate that board relations, politics, personnel issues, workload, time, crisis management, complying with mandates, high visibility, dealing with angry parents, lack of recognition and feedback, and public/community demands and criticism are among the major sources of stress perceived by Connecticut superintendents. These sources of stress have significant impact on superintendents' personal and professional lives. However, superintendents reported a variety of coping strategies they use as they try to attenuate the stress in their lives. Two appendices reproduce the instruments used for the study. (RJM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 427 421

STRESS IN THE SUPERINTENDENCY: IMPLICATIONS FOR ACHIEVING EXCELLENCE

Lystra M. Richardson

Southern Connecticut State University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
L. Richardson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the University Council for Educational Administration, October 30, 1998 – November 1, 1998 in St. Louis Missouri.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA 029 660

Stress in the Superintendency: Implications for Achieving Educational Excellence"

Abstract

This exploratory study of the perceived sources of stress experienced by superintendents in the state of Connecticut utilized both quantitative and qualitative methodology. Two instruments were used in the study. The Administrative Stress Index (ASI), a 35-item survey which respondents were asked to self-rate was distributed to all superintendents in Connecticut public schools (n = 149). The Superintendent Stress Inventory (SSI), an adaptation of Blase's (1986) Teacher Stress Inventory, was used as protocol in conducting interviews with sub sample of superintendents from the high and low ERGs (n = 16) to enhance the depth of the study.

Results indicated that board relations, politics, personnel issues, workload, time, crisis management, complying with mandates, high visibility, dealing with angry parents, lack of recognition and feedback, and public/community demands and criticism are among the major sources of stress perceived by Connecticut superintendents. The findings have implications for practice in terms of achieving educational excellence.

Introduction

The school superintendency has undergone significant change since its inception in the 1800s. Johnson (1996) observed that much has happened in this society since the 1800s that has impacted the superintendency. In a national study, Glass (1992) noted that due to social changes and tensions in the 1960s and 1970s, reform in the 1980s and 1990s, and the growth in state and federal mandates, the role of the contemporary superintendent has changed.

Today, a considerable amount of stress is associated with the responsibilities of the superintendency (Glass, 1992; Hall & Difford, 1992; Eastman & Mirochnik, 1991; Pitner & Ogawa, 1981; Wirt & Christovich, 1989). Glass asserted that "organizations

such as school districts, in which leaders constantly are under substantial pressure, generally do not perform well when they are more preoccupied with handling stress than with developing the organization's potential" (p. 52). Donovan (1987) advised that patterns of job stress within occupations must be understood so that specific conditions can be targeted for preventive action or organizational change initiatives. More specifically, Eastman and Mirochnik (1991) recommended that the role of the superintendent be reevaluated to identify the potential and actual sources of stress so that appropriate interventions and coping strategies can be developed.

The importance of identifying the perceived sources of stress present in the environment has emerged as a common position in three seminal works on occupational stress theory (Caplan, Cobb, French, Van Harrison & Pinneau, 1980; French & Caplan, 1973; McGrath, 1970). While various studies have been done on sources of stress experienced by teachers and principals, relatively little research has been conducted to date to identify specific stressor experienced by superintendents. The purpose of this study was to identify the perceived sources of stress experienced by school superintendents in the state of Connecticut.

Methods

The theoretical framework for this study comprised Stages One and Two of the Administrator Stress Cycle (Gmelch & Swent, 1980) which was designed to measure the unique demands and reflect the multidimensionality of administrative stress. Stage One of the Administrator Stress Cycle is a set of four demands, or stressors, placed on administrators. These demands are separated into four sources of stress: role-based stress, task-based stress, boundary-spanning stress, and conflict-mediating stress. Stage Two of the Administrator Stress Cycle consists of the perception or interpretation of the stressors by the individual.

To explore the major sources of stress among Connecticut's superintendents, and the presence of the four stress factors, the following research questions were asked: 1.

What are the major sources of stress perceived by superintendents in the state of Connecticut? 2. What is the perceived level of role based-stress among superintendents in the state of Connecticut? 3. What is the perceived level of task-based stress among superintendents in the state of Connecticut? 4.What is the perceived level of boundary-spanning stress among superintendents in the state of Connecticut? 5.What is the perceived level of conflict-mediating stress among superintendents in the state of Connecticut?

For the quantitative phase of the study, the Administrative Stress Index (ASI)(See Appendix A) was mailed to the entire population of superintendents in Connecticut (n=149). A return rate of 73% was achieved. The ASI consists of 35 items which respondents were asked to self-rate on a Likert scale, and an additional item, "Other situations about your job that bother you." In developing the ASI, Koch et al. specifically sought to develop a perceived job-related stress scale to reflect the multidimensionality of stressors within complex administrative positions. Internal validity of the instrument was maximized by using a homogeneous population, administrators of educational institutions. "Principal-components analysis of the ASI revealed four interpretable factors that were consistent with theoretically derived models of occupational stress. In this study, high stress was denoted by a mean score above 3.5, medium stress by a score of 2.5 to 3.5, and low stress was indicated by a score below 2.5. It should be noted that the score derived from the ASI represented self-perception of sources of stress, not specifically each participant's level of stress. The instrument did not measure how stressed superintendents were.

For the qualitative phase of the study, Superintendent Stress Inventory (SSI)(Appendix B) which was adapted from Blase's (1986) Teacher Stress Inventory, was used as the interview protocol. The instrument was designed to collect interpretive data from participants in a way that encouraged free expression of personal meanings

associated with work stress. In-person interviews were conducted with a subset of the total sample (n = 16).

The study consisted of three sources of data: Items 1-35 on the ASI, the additional item on the ASI, and the personal interviews. To address the first research question regarding the sources of perceived stress among superintendents in Connecticut, the three sources of data were used. First item means on the ASI were computed. Secondly, the stressors from the additional item on the ASI (n=71) were coded into categories that emerged from the data. The frequency of occurrence of each stressor was recorded and the average Likert scale rating for each category was computed . Thirdly, data collected through the personal interviews were analyzed according to qualitative guidelines developed by Glaser and Strauss (1967) and Glaser (1978) for grounded theory inquiry. These data from the personal interviews addressed research question #1 in that they provided explanations of the major stressors thereby enhancing the depth of the study. Data from all three sources, Items 1-35 on the ASI, the additional item on the ASI, and the personal interview, were further examined and the top six major stressors from each data source were compared.

To address the subsequent research questions regarding the perceived level of role based, task-based, boundary-spanning, and conflict-mediating stress among Connecticut superintendents, two sources of data were used. First, variable means were computed to determine levels of stress (high, moderate or low as previously described) for each of the four stress factors. Secondly, data from the additional item on the ASI, "Other situations about your job that bother you," were categorized into the four stress factors (role-based, task-based, boundary-spanning and conflict-mediating stress).

Results

A descriptive profile of the respondents is provided in Tables 1 and 2.

TABLE 1

Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Variable	n	Percent
Age		
Under 35		
35 to 45	5	4.6
46 to 55	67	62.0
56 to 65	32	29.6
Over 65	4	3.7
Total	108	100.0
Gender		
Male	84	77.8
Female	24	22.2
Total	108	100.0
Student Enrollment		
Fewer than 1,000	20	18.5
1,000 to 4,999	71	65.7
5,000 to 9,999	15	13.9
10,000 or more	2	1.9
Total	108	100.0

TABLE 2

Distribution of Respondents by Years As Superintendent

Years As Superintendent	n	Percent
.08	1	.9
.16	1	.9
.50	1	.9
1.00	1	.9
2.00	4	3.7
2.50	1	.9
2.70	1	.9
2.90	1	.9
3.00	9	8.3
3.50	1	.9
4.00	11	10.2
5.00	9	8.3
6.00	8	7.4
7.00	8	7.4
7.50	1	.9
8.00	3	2.8
8.50	1	.9
9.00	1	.9
10.00	10	9.3
11.00	1	.9
12.00	5	4.6
13.00	1	.9
14.00	5	4.6
15.00	6	5.6
16.00	2	1.9
17.00	4	3.7
19.00	2	1.9
20.00	1	.9
24.00	3	2.8
25.00	2	1.9
27.00	1	.9
28.00	1	.9
33.00	1	.9
Total	108	100.0
Mean	9.28	
Median	7.00	
Mode	4.00	

The specific findings of this study fall into the two clusters which are described below.

Major Sources of Stress

Board relations, politics, personnel issues, workload, time, crisis management, complying with mandates, public criticism and expectations, high visibility, dealing with angry parents, and lack of recognition and feedback are among the major sources of stress perceived by Connecticut superintendents. Table 3 shows a comparison of the top six stressors identified in the three data sources.

TABLE 3

Comparison of Top Six Major Stressors From Three Data Sources

Administrative Stress Index Items 1 - 35	Administrative Stress Index Additional Item	Teacher Stress Inventory Interviews
Trying to gain approval and/or financial support for school programs	Politics	Politics
Too heavy workload	Workload/Lack of Time	Workload/Time
Trying to resolve differences between/ among board members	Board relations	Board relations
Complying with mandates	State and federal mandates	Dealing with crises
Meetings take up too much time	Personnel problems/unions	Personnel/Unions
Imposing high expectations on myself	Public demands	Public criticism

Note: The order in which these stressors appear in Table 3 does not indicate rank. Rather, these stressors are arranged for ease of comparison among the three groups of data.

Time management, politics, and board relations appear to be the most prevalent source of stress for Connecticut superintendents. One superintendent interviewed for this study summed up the present situation, " The key issue in the problem with the superintendency is the volume and complexity of most issues. It isn't that any one issue can't be managed. It's the number of them that come at you and their complexity."

Four stress Factors

Connecticut superintendents perceived low levels of role-based stress, and moderate levels of task-based, boundary-spanning and conflict-mediating stress as measured by items 1-35 on the ASI. (See Tables 4, 5, 6 and 7).

TABLE 4

Summary of Results for the Role-Based Stress Factor

Item	Mean Overall (n = 108)	Mean High ERG (n = 25)	Mean Low ERG (n = 13)
5. Knowing I can't get information needed to carry out my job properly	2.29	2.52	2.00
6. Thinking that I will not be able to satisfy the conflicting demands of board members	2.88	2.96	2.41
13. Trying to resolve differences with board members	2.70	2.92	2.61
16. Not knowing what my board thinks of me or how he/she evaluates my performance	2.41	2.28	1.84
22. Feeling that I have too little authority to carry out responsibilities assigned to me	2.24	2.54	1.69
*30. Being unclear on just what the scope and responsibilities of my job are	1.84	1.83	1.23

34. Trying to influence board actions and decisions that affect me	2.77	2.76	2.30
Stress Factor Mean	2.47	2.55	2.00
Stress Factor r	.83		

Comparison of high and low ERG means
$t = 2.22$ $df = 36$ $p = .03$
*Differences between high and low ERGs is significant ($p < .05$)

TABLE 5

Summary of Results for the Task-Based Stress Factor

Item	Mean Overall (n = 108)	Mean High ERG (n = 25)	Mean Low ERG (n = 13)
1. Being interrupted frequently by telephone calls	2.53	2.44	2.00
2. Supervising and coordinating the tasks of many people	2.25	2.16	1.92
9. Having my work frequently interrupted by staff members who want to talk	2.20	2.21	2.00
10. Imposing excessively high expectations on myself	3.09	3.32	2.53
12. Writing memos, letters, and other communications	2.36	2.32	1.69
18. Feeling I have to participate in school activities outside of the normal working hours at the expense of my personal time	2.87	2.88	2.62
19. Feeling I have too much responsibility delegated to me by my board	2.21	2.29	1.69
26. Feeling that I have too heavy a work load, one that I cannot possibly finish during the normal workday	3.08	3.24	2.46

TABLE 5 (Continued)

Item	Mean Overall (n = 108)	High ERG (n = 25)	Low ERG (n = 13)
*31. Feeling that meetings take up too much time	3.25	3.32	2.46
*32. Trying to complete reports and other paperwork on time	2.88	2.76	1.92
Stress Factor Mean	2.68	2.70	2.13
Stress Factor r	.86		

Comparison of high and low ERG means
t = 2.37 df = 36 p = .02
*Differences between high and low ERGs is significant ($p < .05$)

TABLE 6

Summary of Results for the Boundary-Spanning Stress Factor

Item	Mean Overall (n = 108)	Mean High ERG (n = 25)	Mean Low ERG (n = 13)
21. Preparing and allocating budget resources	2.76	2.80	1.92
*24. Being involved in the collective bargaining process	2.40	2.70	1.38
27. Complying with state, federal and organizational rules and policies	3.08	3.08	3.08
29. Administering the negotiated contract (grievance, interpretations, etc.	2.29	2.32	2.00
35. Trying to gain public approval and/or financial support for school programs	3.56	3.44	3.00
Stress Factor Mean	2.82	2.86	2.14
Stress Factor r	.67		

Comparison of high and low ERG means
$t = 2.78$ $df = 36$ $p = .009$
*Differences between high and low ERGs is significant ($p < .05$)

TABLE 7

Summary of Results for the Conflict-Mediating Stress Factor

Item	Mean Overall (n = 108)	High ERG (n = 25)	Low ERG (n = 13)
7. Trying to resolve differences between/among staff members	2.90	3.08	2.61
*20. Trying to resolve parent/ school conflicts	2.89	2.92	2.07
23. Handling student discipline problems	2.13	2.13	2.00
Stress Factor Mean	2.65	2.76	2.23
Strees Factor r	.60		

Comparison of high and low ERG means
t = 2.05 df = 36 p = .05
*Differences between high and low ERGs is significant ($p < .05$)

However, findings from the additional item on the ASI, "Other situations about your job that bother you," showed that Connecticut superintendents perceive a high level of all four stress factors work as shown in Appendix A.

Conclusion

Results of this study showed that Connecticut superintendents perceived the stress factors listed in items 1 to 35 on the ASI as producing low to moderate levels of stress, while the additional stressors they themselves wrote in response to the additional item on the ASI, "Other situations about your job that bother you," were shown to produce high levels stress. The first conclusion, then, is that the ASI, in its current form,

may not accurately reflect the stressors of the contemporary Connecticut superintendency, or that superintendents believed they could more accurately describe their sources of stress themselves. Interestingly, however, the highest rated stressors on the ASI, data collected through the additional item on the ASI, and the data from personal interviews, all revealed three of the same major sources of stress: Politics, heavy workload/time, and board relations. Additionally, at least two of the three data sources revealed the common stressors of complying with mandates, personnel problems, unions, and public demands/criticism. Clearly, the data shows that these are the major sources of stress perceived by Connecticut superintendents.

The major sources of stress identified in this study have significant impact on superintendents' personal and professional lives, and engender a range of negative feelings. Superintendents reported a variety of coping strategies they use in attempts to attenuate the stress in their lives. These findings, though not directly related to the research questions posed in this study, are briefly reported here as they add further depth to the study.

To cope with the stressors of their position, Connecticut superintendents employ a variety of approaches which they consider effective. These included hard physical exercise, delegating some tasks, talking to friends, communicating with board members, and venting with their spouses. Other coping strategies such as, withdrawing, acquiescence, self talk, and trying to maintain mental distance, were rated as moderately effective. Nonetheless, the major stressors of the position engendered feelings of anger, frustration, resentment, and anxiety. Connecticut superintendents also reported experiencing depressive states such as feeling powerless, hurt, devalued, unappreciated and lonely.

It is interesting to note that the word "frustration" appeared more frequently in the data than all other descriptors of feeling states, and that Connecticut superintendents used more words to describe depressive states than any other feeling state. Additionally,

in explaining the stressors of their work, Connecticut superintendents alluded to conflicting feelings when they described feelings of "being torn," and "puzzled." A few positive feeling states also appeared in the data. These included: "Sense of importance," "ego fulfillment," and "confidence."

Implications for Practice

Superintendents face myriad stressors in their work daily. Many see stress as an inherent part of their role. While some report feelings of importance and satisfaction from their contribution to public education, others bemoan the personal and professional toll of the job on their lives. In addition to the volume and complexity of issues, the demands placed on superintendents by the community, long work hours, high visibility, time constraints, personnel problems, politics, and board relations also figure prominently in precipitating stress among Connecticut superintendents. Coupled with the feelings of anger, resentment and frustration that underscore the stress experienced by superintendents, the finding that Connecticut superintendents used more words to describe depressive feeling states than any other feeling state, paint a rather bleak picture of the Connecticut superientendency in terms of stress management and its potential impact on their effectiveness.

The findings of this study hold several implications for practice. If Connecticut's public schools are to meet the challenges of the 21st century, it would be worth the effort to examine the organizational aspects of the position. Specifically the possibility of reduced frequency of board turnover, increased recognition and feedback, training in handling the political dimensions of the job and the boundary spanning role, and more effective strategies for dealing with stress all need to be examined. This calls for greater awareness in professional training programs that superintendents should be better prepared to cope with stress.

With regard to board relations, the issue of board turnover, in particular, is of concern to Connecticut superintendents in that it appears to exacerbate problems already

inherent in the superintendent/board relationship. Superintendents were vehement in describing the stress of adjusting to new board members, in some cases every two years. Specifically, they cited the time it takes to find out new board members' agendas, and to build a relationship, as well as time invested in bringing them up to speed on what is taking place in the school district. Furthermore, the internal politics of the board changes when new members are elected, and this impacts a superintendent's interaction with the board as a whole. Moreover, the political dimensions of the position which involves interaction with politicians, and particularly the dependence on city officials for funding adds to the complexity of the position.

In recent years, this complexity has been growing even more with the diverse demands placed on education. The purview of the superintendent is expanding into areas such as empowering teachers, and fostering increased parental and community involvement. This increasing boundary spanning role is another facet of the job that engulfs their time, and contributes to stress. Connecticut superintendents complained about the amount of time spent with community groups, the high visibility, the ongoing demand for high quality interpersonal communication, dealing with angry parents, managing crises, and the public criticism and demands. All this takes a high toll on their personal and professional lives. Noting that the role of superintendents is shifting from one of directing and controlling to that of guiding, facilitating, and coordinating, Carter and Cunningham (1997), also noted the difficulty of the role given the current context of intense public pressure and criticism. The findings of this study clearly show that Connecticut superintendents are indeed feeling the stress of public pressure and cirticism. Superintendents bemoaned the time taken away from their educational leadership by political leadership activities. The study showed that the political aspects of the position detract from educational leadership in that they are stressful, and take up considerable amounts of superintendents' time. If educational excellence is to be attained, superintendents must make student achievement their major focus. However, with

politics and other matters causing stress and consuming an inordinate amount of their time, superintendents need support in maintaining the focus on student achievement.

In conclusion, if, as the AASA (1993) pointed out that the quality of America's schools, to a great extent, depends on the effectiveness of the school superintendent, and as Glass (1992) noted when leaders are under extreme stress, and organizations such as school districts, in which leaders constantly are under substantial pressure, generally do not perform well when they are more preoccupied with handling stress than with developing the organization's potential, it is, then, imperative that measures be taken to help superintendents cope more effectively with the stressors inherent in their position.

References

American Association of School Administrators. (1993). Professional standards for the Superintendency. Washington, DC: American Association of School Administrators.

Blase, J. (1986, Spring). A Qualitative Analysis of Sources of Teacher Stress: Consequences for Performance. American Educational Research Journal, 21 (1), 13-40.

Caplan, R. D., Cobb., French, J. R. P., Jr., Harrison, R. V., Pinneau, S. R., Jr., (1980). Job demands and worker health. Lansing, MI: Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.

Carter, G. R. & Cunningham, W.G. (1997). The American School Superintendent: Leading in an Age of Pressure. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1997.

Donovan, R. (1987). Stress in the workplace: A framework for research and practice. US Social Casework, 68 (5), 259-266.

Eastman, M. & Mirochnik, D. A. (1991, June). Stressed for success: A study of stress and the superintendency. (Occasional Paper Series, No. 14). Orono, ME: Maine University, College of Education.

French, J. R. P., & Caplan, R. D. (1973). Organizational stress and individual strain. In A. J. Marrow (Ed.). The failure of success. New York: AMACOM.

Glaser, B. (1978). Theoretical sensitivity: Advances in the methodology of grounded theory. Mill Valley,CA: The Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. & Strauss, A. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualititative research.Chicago: Aldine.

Glass, T. E. (1992). The study of the American school superintendency '92: America's education leaders in a time of reform. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Gmelch, W. H., & Swent, B. (1980). The administrator stress cycle. Pullman, WA: Washington State University.

Hall, G. E.& Difford, G. A. (1992, April). Perceptions of the exiting superintendent phenomenon. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Johnson, S. M. (1996). Leading to change: The challenge of the new superintendency. San Francisco, CA: Josses-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Koch, J. L., Tung, R., Gmelch, W., & Swent, B. (1982). Job stress among school administrators: Factorial dimensions and differential effects. Journal of Applied Psychology, 67, (4), 493-499.

McGrath, J. E. (1970). Social and psychological factors in stress. New York: Hot, Rinehart & Winston, Inc.

Olsen, H. C. (1926). The work of boards of education. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University Bureau of Publications.

Pitner, N. J. & Ogawa, R. (1981, Spring). Organizational leadership: The case of the School superintendent. Educational Administration Quarterly 17, (2), 45-65.

Shibles, M. R. & Tirozzi, G. N. (1995). The school superintendency in Connecticut's schools: An introductory analysis and preliminary standards. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 9, 411- 428.

Wirt, F. M. & Christovich, L. (1989). Administrators' perceptions of policy influence: Conflict management styles and roles. Educational Administration Quarterly, 25 (1), 5-35.

Administrative Stress Index

Part I

Biographical Background

1. How many years have you been a superintendent? _____ years

2. How many years have you been a superintendent in this district? _____ years

3. How old are you? (Please check one)

__Under 35 __46 to 55 __Over 65

__35 to 45 __56 to 65

4. Are you __ male __ female?

5. What is the student enrollment of your school district? (Please check one)

___ fewer than 1,000 ___ 5,000 to 9,999

___ 1,000 to 4,999 ___ 10,000 or more

6. In which Educational Reference Group (ERG) has your district been placed? ____

Part II

School administrators have identified the following 35 work related situations as sources of concern. It is possible that some of these situations bother you more than others. How much are you bothered by each of the situations listed below? Please circle the appropriate response.

	Not Applicable	Rarely or Never Bothers Me		Occasionally Bothers Me		Frequently Bothers Me
1. Being interrupted frequently by telephone calls	NA	1	2	3	4	5
2. Supervising and coordinating the tasks of many people	NA	1	2	3	4	5
3. Feeling staff members don't understand my goals and expectations	NA	1	2	3	4	5
4. Feeling that I am not fully qualified to handle my job	NA	1	2	3	4	5
5. Knowing I can't get information needed to carry out my job properly	NA	1	2	3	4	5
6. Thinking that I will not be able to satisfy the conflicting demands of board members	NA	1	2	3	4	5
7. Trying to resolve differences between/among board members	NA	1	2	3	4	5
8. Feeling not enough is expected of me by board members	NA	1	2	3	4	5
9. Having my work frequently interrupted by staff members who want to talk	NA	1	2	3	4	5
10. Imposing excessively high expectations on myself	NA	1	2	3	4	5
11. Feeling pressure for better job performance	NA	1	2	3	4	5
12. Writing memos, letters and other communications	NA	1	2	3	4	5
13. Trying to resolve differences with board members	NA	1	2	3	4	5
14. Speaking in front of groups	NA	1	2	3	4	5
15. Attempting to meet social expectations (housing, clubs friends etc.)	NA	1	2	3	4	5

	Not Applicable	Rarely or Never Bothers Me		Occasionally Bothers Me		Frequently Bothers Me
16. Not knowing what board members think of me, or how they evaluate my performance	NA	1	2	3	4	5
17. Having to make decisions that affect the lives of individual people that I know (colleagues staff members, students etc.)	NA	1	2	3	4	5
18. Feeling I have to participate in school activities outside of the normal working hours at the expense of my personal time	NA	1	2	3	4	5
19. Feeling that I have too much responsibility delegated to me by my board	NA	1	2	3	4	5
20. Trying to resolve parent/school conflicts	NA	1	2	3	4	5
21. Preparing and allocating budget resources	NA	1	2	3	4	5
22. Feeling that I have too little authority to carry out responsibilities assigned to me	NA	1	2	3	4	5
23. Handling student discipline problems	NA	1	2	3	4	5
24. Being involved in the collective bargaining process	NA	1	2	3	4	5
25. Evaluating staff members' performance	NA	1	2	3	4	5
26. Feeling that I have too heavy a work load, one that I cannot possibly finish during the normal work day	NA	1	2	3	4	5
27. Complying with state, federal and organizational rules and policies	NA	1	2	3	4	5
28. Feeling that the progress on my job is not what it should or could be	NA	1	2	3	4	5
29. Administering the negotiated contract (grievances, interpretation etc.)	NA	1	2	3	4	5

	Not Applicable	Rarely or Never Bothers Me		Occasionally Bothers Me		Frequently Bothers Me
30. Being unclear on just what the scope and responsibilities of my job are	NA	1	2	3	4	5
31. Feeling that meetings take up too much time	NA	1	2	3	4	5
32. Trying to complete reports and other paper work on time	NA	1	2	3	4	5
33. Trying to resolve differences between/among staff members	NA	1	2	3	4	5
34. Trying to influence board actions and decisions that affect me	NA	1	2	3	4	5
35 Trying to gain public approval and/or financial support for school programs	NA	1	2	3	4	5
Other situations about your job that bothers you						
		1	2	3	4	5
		1	2	3	4	5

Thank you for assisting in completing this survey.
Please mail the completed questionnaire in the addressed and stamped envelope to: Lystra M. Richardson, 103 Highland Ave. Branford, CT 06405.

Superintendent Stress Inventory

This questionnaire is designed to determine what is stressful for your in your work. On the following pages, you will be asked to identify and describe three factors that are stressful for you, the approaches you use to deal with stress associated with each factor, and the effectiveness of such approaches. Please describe the THREE work factors that are most stressful for you. It is very important that you include enough information about each stress factor to present a clear picture of what you mean.

Number of years as Superintendent _____

Number of years as Superintendent in this district _____

Gender --- Male

--- Female

FACTOR #1:

1. **Identify** stress factor. _____

Describe fully what the stress factor means to you. Give an **Example** to illustrate what the stress factor means to you:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. Explain why the stress factor you identified causes you stress(#1):_____

_____

_____

_____

APPROACHES:

3. List and **describe** the most important typical **approaches**(if any) you use to deal with the stress factor identified above and indicate the degree of effectiveness(or ineffectiveness) of each approach. (Do not exclude approaches you may feel are socially unacceptable.)

	Not very effective				Very effective
a._____	1	2	3	4	5
b._____	1	2	3	4	5
c._____	1	2	3	4	5
d._____	1	2	3	4	5

FEELINGS:

4. Describe your typical **feelings** associated with the stress factor._____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPROACHES:

5. List and **describe** the most important **approaches**(if any) you use to deal with your **feelings** identified in number 4 and indicate the degree of effectiveness(or ineffectiveness) of each approach. (Do not exclude approaches you may feel are socially unacceptable.)

	Not very effective				Very effective
a._____	1	2	3	4	5
b._____	1	2	3	4	5
c._____	1	2	3	4	5
d._____	1	2	3	4	5

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FACTOR #2:

1. **Identify** stress factor. _____

Describe fully what the stress factor means to you. Give an **Example** to illustrate what the stress factor means to you:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. Explain why the stress factor you identified causes you stress(#1):_____

_____

_____

_____

APPROACHES:

3. **List** and **describe** the most important typical **approaches**(if any) you use to deal with the stress factor identified above and indicate the degree of **effectiveness**(or ineffectiveness) of each approach. (Do not exclude approaches you may feel are socially unacceptable.)

	Not very effective				Very effective
a._____	1	2	3	4	5
b._____	1	2	3	4	5
c._____	1	2	3	4	5
d._____	1	2	3	4	5

FEELINGS:

4. Describe your typical **feelings** associated with the stress factor._____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPROACHES:

5. **List** and **describe** the most important **approaches**(if any) you use to deal with your **feelings** identified in number 4 and indicate the degree of effectiveness(or ineffectiveness) of each approach. (Do not exclude approaches you may feel are socially unacceptable.)

	Not very effective				Very effective
a._____	1	2	3	4	5
b._____	1	2	3	4	5
c._____	1	2	3	4	5
d._____	1	2	3	4	5

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FACTOR #3:

1. **Identify** stress factor. _____

Describe fully what the stress factor means to you. Give an **Example** to illustrate what the stress factor means to you:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. Explain why the stress factor you identified causes you stress(#1):_____

_____

_____

_____

APPROACHES:

3. **List** and **describe** the most important typical **approaches**(if any) you use to deal with the stress factor identified above and indicate the degree of **effectiveness**(or ineffectiveness) of each approach. (Do not exclude approaches you may feel are socially unacceptable.)

	Not very effective				Very effective
a._____	1	2	3	4	5
b._____	1	2	3	4	5
c._____	1	2	3	4	5
d._____	1	2	3	4	5

FEELINGS:

4. Describe your typical **feelings** associated with the stress factor._____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPROACHES:

5. **List** and **describe** the most important **approaches**(if any) you use to deal with your **feelings** identified in number 4 and indicate the degree of **effectiveness**(or ineffectiveness) of each approach. (Do not exclude approaches you may feel are socially unacceptable.)

	Not very effective				Very effective
a._____	1	2	3	4	5
b._____	1	2	3	4	5
c._____	1	2	3	4	5
d._____	1	2	3	4	5

BEST COPY AVAILABLE